

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/074,345 02/12/2002 | | Halbert Tam | AMAT/6075/CMP/CMP/RKK 5690 | | | |
| 32588 | 7590 05/ | /24/2006 | | EXAMINER | | |
| APPLIED MATERIALS, INC. | | | | MCDONALD, SHANTESE L | | |
| 2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061 SANTA CLARA, CA 95050 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | | 3723 | | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 05/24/2006 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| <u> </u> | | e |
|----------------------|--------------|---|
| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| 10/074,345 | TAM ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Shantese L. McDonald | 3723 | |

| | Onantese L. MicDonald | 3723 | |
|--|---|--|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 12 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m | fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or a statutory period for reply expire is the checked, check either box (b) or a statutory period for reply expires the checked, check either box (c) or a statutory period for reply expires the checked, check either box (a) or a statutory period for reply expires on: | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin | g date of the final rejecti | on. |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | 06.07(f). | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The appropri | iate extension fee ce action: or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | ns of the date of e appeal. Since |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co | but prior to the date of filing a brief nsideration and/or search (see NO | , will <u>not</u> be entered b TE below): | ecause |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | | , , | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or | | ducing or simplifying | the issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally rei | acted claims | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | corresponding number of imany rej | ected ciairis. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. | 21 See attached Notice of Non-Co | mnliant Amendment | (DTOL_324) |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | impliant Americanent | (I TOL-02+). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | timely filed amendme | ent canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | II be entered and an e | explanation of |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-25,30-38</u> | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good anwas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidav | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is | ot be entered s necessary and |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fai | Is to provide a |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | t does NOT place the application in | n condition for allowar | nce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other: | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N | lo(s) | 7. Halo |
| | | Joseph Supervisory F | J. Hail, III Patent Examine |

Technology Center 3700

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Srinivasan et al. and Spikes, JR. both teach a multiple polishing procedure for removing dielectric material disposed on a substrate, using a fixed abrasive and a polishing solution. Spikes, Jr. teaches that typically CMP is used to planarize a non-uniform polishing surface of a process layer and CMP may be used to reduce surface variations in a pre-polish step. Therefore the Spikes, Jr. reference was cited and teaches that a pre-polish step during the planarization of a substrate with dielectric polishing layers and during a polishing procedure with multiple polishing steps, is a known procedure in the art.